

REMARKS

This amendment: (1) summarizes the personal Interview conducted June 7, 2006 with Primary Examiner Syed Zia and Examiner Aravind k. Moorthy, and (2) supplements the Amendment under 37 CFR 1.111, filed May 28, 2006 for the above-designated application in response to the Office Action of February 28, 2006.

Applicants' attorney thanks Primary Examiner Syed Zia and Examiner Aravind Moorthy for the courtesy of a personal Interview conducted June 7, 2006. At the interview, Applicants' attorney distinguished independent claims 1, 5, 13, and 24 from USP 6,944,765 to G. Rose et al. Specifically, Applicants' attorney noted and the Examiners acknowledged that Rose fails to disclose: (i) a distributed environment, (ii) generating a POW in a certain amount of computation performed by a user within a specified interval of time, and (iii) re-using the POW in another task. The Examiners further noted the independent claims were indefinite by failure to identify the functional units or entities involved in the method. Applicants' attorney discussed proposed New Claims, further defining the methods to overcome a possible rejection of indefiniteness. The Examiner still further noted that the rejections and objections of claims 25-28 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph had been overcome by the amendment to the claims. The Examiner will conduct an update search; consider the New Claims, and act upon the application, taking into consideration the patentability arguments in the Remarks included in the amendment filed May 28, 2006 and the present supplemental amendment.

The supplement amends independent claims 1, 3, 5, 13 and 24 to correct informalities and adds New Claims 29-31 to overcome a possible Examiner's objection in the next Office Action of claims 1-28 as indefinite by failure to define the functional units or entities involved in the method. Claims 29-31 correspond to claims 1, 13 and 24 and are patentable over the cited art for the same reasons indicated for claims 1, 13 and 24 in the amendment filed May 28, 2006. Moreover, claims 29-31 specify the functional units involved in the method and should preclude any objection or rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph for indefiniteness. Entry of the New Claims 29-31 and allowance are requested.

CONCLUSION

Claims 29-31 have been added to the application to specify the functional units involved in the methods of Claims 1, 13 and 24. The personal Interview conducted June 7, 2006 has been summarized. Entry of the amendment and allowance of claims 1-31 are requested.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. JAKOBSSON 23-5 (3037-4196). A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. JAKOBSSON 23-5 (3037-4196). A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: June 13, 2006

By:

Joseph C. Redmond, Jr.
Joseph C. Redmond, Jr.
Reg. No. 18,753
Telephone: (202) 857-7887
Facsimile: (202) 857-7929

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Morgan & Finnegan L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York New York